

RECEIVED

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

MAY 17 1996

From: Funguy <jsamuel@exis.net>
To: A20.A20(kwerbach)
Date: 5/17/96 6:04am
Subject: telephony communication programs/services. namely freetel

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Dear sir,

To my knowledge, if there is no activation of new services involved in making a call, then the "call", such as one made with "telephony" may not be billed and is not within the jurisdiction of the FCC. So far as I understand the process, ".wav" files or their equivalent are sent between computers and do a fair job of mimicking telephone conversations. If you were to outlaw telephony, you'd be outlining the logirhythm that allows ".wav"'s to be run at any time on-line. Sound impractical? Imagine how many millions of people send "wav" files attached to e-mails every day. Those would have to go. Video-teleconferencing? Nope! Not with your computer you wouldn't...that would fall under the same guidelines.

It seems as though someone has allowed this abhoringly weak argument on behalf of long-distance carriers to go too far already, and it's now time for the FCC to look all of them in the eye and say, "...sorry guys. Telephony's legal, and it's going to stay that way...for good! Get used to the idea...". Sir, what the companies petitioning you to ban "telephony" services are asking you to do is eliminate new competition for them. This isn't a new ploy, as I'm sure you know, but if you allow yourself to fall for it...all of us, including yourself, will have to pay for the mistake.

A simple analogy I could use would be to ask you (somewhat rhetirically, but it makes the point pretty darn well) if person A calls person B locally, then person A calls someone long distance on a three-way connection, would both person A and B be billed for the long distance call? The answer is of course not, and that should be clear enough without any explanations.

These "calls" placed over "freetel" and other such services are not telephone calls at all. They are transfers of computer audio files. The FCC hasn't the time, money, or resources to screen even a fraction of the ".wav"'s sent on-line. Besides, there's nothing illegal, improper, devious, malicious, or immoral about the process to begin with!

As time passes and technology leaps forward, you and I will see many windrous thing evolve over the internet and it's sucessors. I dearly hope that you consider the fact that banning this type of service will be a hinderance of progress, not a protection of law and people. Telephone companies will argue that this is a telephone service, and the defenders of "telephony" will argue that it simply isn't bearing both proof and letters petitioning against ANY ban or restriction of this kind of information/data transfer. My dearest hopes are that you and your fellows at the FCC will see the truth. The most simple truth. If you restrict "telephony", you will have been taken for a ride. One with nothing but long-term costs to almost every american consumer over time. Yourself included.

The only people to benefit from this legislation are big phone companies that simply can't compete with this sort of service which is more like HAM radio than a phone call. See that. Know that. Judge that and the other information that will be provided you and aim your arrow true toward the right target. Leave Freetel and it's competitors be. They're legitimate and useful services that, hopefully, everyone will some day be able to enjoy. Don't stop progress. Stop conspiracy. Put an end to protectionism by government regulatory agencies, and tell the long-distance carriers no.

If you have the time to respond to this, I'd appreciate it, but I'll certainly understand if you don't. This whole thing most likely has you mail-bogged, so if you can't, don't sweat it too much. I'd just like to think that perhaps you've read this, and taken my letters contents to heart involving this matter.

"...and that's all I have to say about that." ----Forrest Gump

Do right. My confidence leans toward the belief that you will

Sincerely,
James B Samuel <jbsam@exis.net>

No. of Copies rec'd
LBI:ARJDE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

From: Brodie Lockard <brod@jessica.stanford.edu>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 5/16/96 7:02pm
Subject: internet voice communications

MAY 17 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

I don't think internet voice communications should become regulated

Brodie Lockard

NO. OF PAGES 1
JUL 18 1996

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAY 17 1996

From: Herb Reeves <hrreeves@FastLane.NET>
To: A20.A20(kwerbach)
Date: 5/16/96 7:29pm
Subject: Internet phone

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Sir: I am a retired senior who utilizes the internet as an info source as well as entertainment. I also have retired and disabled kinfolk around the country. Freetel has provided me with a way to communicate with them through computer technology. I could not afford to talk with them otherwise. I respectfully request that my Government not interfere with this privilage.

sincerely,

Herbert R. Reeves
6105 RockyPoint Trail
Fort Worth ,Texas 76135

No. of Copies: 1
100-400000

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAY 17 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: Pete Hoffswell <pete@grfn.org>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 5/16/96 6:50pm
Subject: (Fwd) fcc and iphone

Please accept the following information. Please do not make the use of the internet for audio communications illegal. It just doesn't make sense!

----- Forwarded Message Follows -----

From: tss@ramlink.net
Date: Sun, 12 May 1996 15:11:04 -0400
To: tss@ramlink.net
Subject: fcc and iphone

KE4LAE KF4CQL
Sunday, May 12, 1996

Following is a copy of an action that could prevent developement of internet phone video phones and the like. Licensed amateurs should note that you are authorized for unpaid international communications by the act of 1934. If you agree that this would be an infringement copy the responce that follows and send as specified. Dont let "ma bell" screw up something good.

Federal Communications Commission
1919 M St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

DA 96-414 Report No. CC 96-10 COMMON CARRIER ACTION

March 25, 1996

COMMON CARRIER BUREAU CLARIFIES AND EXTENDS REQUEST FOR COMMENT ON ACTA PETITION RELATING TO "INTERNET PHONE" SOFTWARE AND HARDWARE - RM No. 8775

Comments Due: May 8, 1996

Replies Due: June 8, 1996

On March 4, 1996, America's Carriers Telecommunication Association (ACTA) filed a Petition for Declaratory Ruling, Special Relief, and Institution of a Rulemaking relating to the provision of interstate and international interexchange telecommunications service via the "Internet" by non-tariffed, uncertified entities. ACTA alleges that providers of "Internet phone" software and hardware are operating as uncertified and unregulated common carriers, in contravention of FCC rules, and seeks three forms of relief.

First, ACTA seeks a declaratory ruling establishing the Commission's authority over interstate and international telecommunications services using the Internet. Second, ACTA asks the Commission for special relief: to order named and unnamed respondents immediately to stop provisioning Internet phone software and hardware without complying with the regulatory requirements of the Communications Act of 1934. Finally, ACTA urges the Commission to initiate a rulemaking proceeding to consider rules governing the use of the Internet for the provision of telecommunications services.

On March 8, 1996, a public notice was issued seeking comment on ACTA's petition for rulemaking. When petitions for rulemaking are filed with the Commission, a public notice is routinely issued shortly after the petition is filed. The Commission's goal in seeking comment is to develop a record on which to base a decision about whether or not the issues raised by the outside party merit consideration.

We hereby establish a consolidated pleading cycle for all of ACTA's requests. This proceeding will be treated as non-restricted for purposes of the Commission's ex parte rules. See generally 47 C.F.R. 1.1200-1.1216.

Because of the complex issues implicated by the ACTA petition, the deadlines for filing comments on the petition are hereby extended. All comments on ACTA's petition should be filed on or before May 8, 1996, and all reply comments should be filed on or before June 8, 1996. Commenters should file an original and four copies of their comments with the

Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W., Room 222, Washington, D.C. 20554.

A copy should also be sent to Wanda Harris, Common Carrier Bureau, FCC, Room 518, 1919 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20554, and to the Commission's contractor for public service records duplication:

No. of Copies rec'd
List A16.1

ITS, Inc., 2100 M Street, N.W., Suite 140, Washington, D.C. 20037.

Informal comments in this proceeding may also be filed via electronic mail to <rm8775@fcc.gov>. All filings in this non-docketed proceeding should reference RM No. 8775.

The full text of the petition, and the comments and reply comments will be available for inspection and duplication during regular business hours in the FCC Reference Center,

Federal Communications Commission, 1919 M Street, N.W., Room 239,

Washington, D.C. 20554. Copies may also be obtained from

International Transcription Service, Inc. (ITS, Inc.), 2100 M Street, N.W.,

Suite 140, Washington, D.C. 20037 (202/857-3800). This public notice and additional information on filing

comments will be available on the Internet through the "recent actions" section of the Common

Carrier Bureau home page at <<http://www.fcc.gov/ccb.html>>.

For further information, contact Kevin Werbach, 202/418-1597 of the

Common Carrier Bureau.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A response to :

Report No. CC 96-10 COMMON CARRIER ACTION

March 25, 1996

COMMON CARRIER BUREAU CLARIFIES AND EXTENDS REQUEST FOR COMMENT ON
ACTA PETITION RELATING TO "INTERNET PHONE" SOFTWARE AND HARDWARE - RM No. 8775

in order to promote electronic commerce by facilitating the use of

Internet phone, Web talk or Cuseeme like software , and for other purposes.

we the undersigned declare the above action to be an infringement on

UNITED STATES citizens ability to use the Information Super Highway.

In that:

(1) The ability to digitize information makes
carrying out tremendous amounts of commerce and
personal communication electronically possible.

(2) Miniaturization, disturbed computing, and
reduced transmission costs make communication via
electronic networks a reality.

(3) The explosive growth in the Internet and
other computer networks reflects the potential
growth of electronic commerce and personal
communication.

(4) The Internet and the global information
infrastructure have the potential to revolutionize
the way individuals and businesses conduct business.

(5) United States computer, computer software and
hardware, communications and electronics business are
leading the world technology revolution as those
businesses have developed and are prepared to offer
immediately to computer users worldwide a variety of
communications and computers hardware and computer
software that provide audio and video service.

(6) United States businesses seek to market the
products described in paragraph (5) in competition
with scores of foreign businesses in many countries
that offer similar, and frequently better products and programs.

(7) UNITED STATES businesses have been discouraged
from further developing and marketing products with
phone or video phone services because of regulatory efforts
by large corporate communications organizations, acting through the
Federal Communications Commission.

- (8) The Federal Communication Commission is ignoring the fact that-
- (A) there is no demonstrated public demand for features which give phone companies exclusive access to international communications and
 - (B) numerous alternatives are available commercially from foreign suppliers and free of charge from the Internet.
 - (C) the communications act of 1934 is outdated and in need of modification due to technological advances in international communications
- (9) In order to promote electronic commerce in the twenty-first century to realize the full potential of the Internet and other computer networks-
- (A) United States businesses should be encouraged to develop and market products and programs offering phone and video phone services: and
 - (B) the Federal Government should be prohibited from promulgating regulations and adopting policies that discourage the use and sale of communications technology.
- (10) Should rules be enacted to restrict Internet communications
Laws will be required to prevent Government Agencies from inacting regulations detrimental to public interests

(s) Greg Payton
Ashland, KY 41102
May 12, 1996

Copy, change the name and sign the above response.

Commenters should file an original and four copies of their comments with
Office of the Secretary,
Federal Communications Commission,
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 222,
Washington, D.C. 20554

A copy should also be sent to
Wanda Harris,
Common Carrier Bureau, FCC,
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 518

Washington, D.C. 20554,
 and to the Commission's contractor for public service records duplication:
 ITS, Inc.,
 2100 M Street, N.W.,
 Suite 140,
 Washington, D.C. 20037.
 send the same here
 Informal comments in this proceeding may also be filed via electronic mail to <rm8775@fcc.gov>.

Greg Payton

```

      *          dZZZZZ,          *
      dZZZZ ZZ,
* ,AZZZZZSZZZZ `ZZ, _ *
,ZZZZZZV' \ZZZZ `Z,\
,ZZZ ZZ . ZZZZ `V
ZZZZV' ZZ ZZZZ \
V I . ZZ \ZZZZZ
I \ ZZ, E ZZZZZZ,
/ ZZ\ ZZZ ZZZ `Z,
ZZ I ZZZ ZZ, `Z, *
ZZ ZZZ Z Z, `I
Z ZZ V `Z \
V ZC I V
Z I VZR I
\ \ I ZA
\ C C
\ K / / K
A \ \ / / / /
\ \ / / /
http://ram.ramlink.net/~tss/

```

> Pete Hoffswell - Holland, MI - pete@grfn.org <
 > http://www.grfn.org/~pete - 616-738-0934 <